DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 077 HE 012 330

AUTHOR Klitgaard, Robert E.
TITLE On Reviewing International Studies. Number 81 D.
INSTITUTION Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Kennedy School of Government.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 31p.; Discussion Paper Series
AVAILABLE FROM Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 79 Boylston St., Cambridge, MA 02158

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; Change Strategies; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *International Education; *International Educational Exchange; *International Studies; Policy Formation; Program Evaluation; *Research Coordinating Units; Universities

ABSTRACT

In an examination of the main issues facing international studies at American universities, demands for more centers, more scholarships, and more research funds are discounted. Close review of the educational and scholarly aims and achievements of international research centers is advocated. It is suggested that useful reviews of this sort should be local--at particular centers and universities--and should focus on new sorts of planning, management, and integration as the key steps for the future. Some of the main issues related to university-based reviews, particularly of area centers, are outlined. Three questions are addressed: (1) What are the objectives of area research? (2) According to insiders, what have been the principal achievements?; and (3) What are some of the main problems and opportunities facing area centers now? Implications for universities are cited regarding undergraduate training, the research agenda, professional schools; information, and management. Suggestions are provided for topics for university-based reviews: e.g., determining the most effective type of coordinating council across centers; investigating whether an associate dean or a provost for international activities would be desirable; and assessing long-term stays by foreign visitors so they could participate in teaching as well as research. A list of references is included. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183077

ON REVIEWING INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

ROBERT E. KLITGAARD

FEBRUARY 1980

NUMBER 81 D

HE 012 330

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

Contrary to much current advocacy rhetoric, the main issues facing international studies at American universities probably do not involve more centers, more scholarships, and more research funds. A skeptical look needs to be taken at the educational and scholarly aims and achievements of international research centers. Useful reviews of this sort are likely to be local: at particular centers and universities. And such examinations are likely to focus on new sorts of planning, management, and integration as the key steps for the future.

This paper has two purposes: to encourage such university-based reviews and to outline some of the main issues related thereto. The area centers are the focus, as their problems are particularly likely to stimulate reflection. Three questions are addressed. First, what are the objectives of area research? Second, according to insiders, what have been the principal achievements? And third, what are some of the main problems and opportunities facing area centers now? The paper concludes with suggestions of topics for university-based reviews.

ON REVIEWING INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Robert E. Klitgaard

February 1980

The Presidential Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies is only one of a number of national efforts to gain support for internationally oriented research at American universities. The time seems ripe for a reassessment of international research centers not only by foundations, national commissions, and governmental agencies, but by universities themselves. In times of declining enrollments and shrinking budgets, harder and harder questions will be asked of the relatively expensive international centers that have grown up over the past twenty to thirty years. It will be important not to leave the terms of the discussion up to the internationalists themselves, as has tended to happen so far in the national reviews.[1]

This paper has two purposes: to encourage university-based reviews of international research centers and to outline some of the main issues related thereto. The area centers are the main focus, for they raise issues particularly likely to stimulate reflection. Three questions are addressed. First, what are the objectives of area research? Second, according to insiders, what have been the main achievements? And third, what are some of the main problems and opportunities facing area centers now?

Area Studies in the United States

The history of area centers is often seen as having several distinguishing features.[2] With the expansion of America's perceived national interest after World War II, area studies were advocated as

a way of helping the United States, as a world power, to understand regions heretofore considered of little relevance. Area specialists were needed, and these specialists should combine regional expertise with professional qualifications in one of the academic disciplines. The early area programs were financed by the universities themselves, but the monumental assistance of the Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations was crucial. The Ford Foundation alone gave $340 million to international studies between 1951 and 1975.

The new centers emphasized the social sciences, rather than the traditional areas of language, culture, and history. But almost all area programs were interdisciplinary in the sense of including representatives ranging across the humanities and social sciences; and most directors have been historians or humanists. The individuals concerned were usually appointed to academic departments. Thus, they were professionally dependent on their disciplinary rather than their area connection for such basic matters as pay and promotion. The oldest of the new social-science-oriented centers dated from about 1947 and related primarily to Japan, China, and the Soviet Union. Most of the programs specializing in other regions were of later vintage; indeed, the majority began after 1959.

Several authors note that a certain mystique developed about the intellectual approach of the area centers. "Areas" were sometimes touted as the basic mode or unit of scholarly organization; "interdisciplinarity" was sometimes lauded as an alternative to the standard disciplines. Area specialists often partook in a sense of shared

excitement. Their centers were calculated to redress the older ethnocentric bias of the disciplines, as well as to pursue knowledge of both humane and disciplinary importance. Often, group loyalties and what Ward calls "academic nationalism" ensued. Interestingly, the loyalties were not usually to the area approach but to the particular area with which the scholar was involved.[3] Leonard Binder's remarks about Middle Eastern studies have been echoed, less bluntly perhaps, about most other regions:

> The fact is that Middle Eastern studies are beset by subjective projections, displacements of affect, ideological distortion, romantic mystification, and religious bias, as well as by a great deal of incompetent scholarship. To my mind the greatest problem is that of incompetent scholarship, but incompetence can often be disguised or even defended as the application of a subjective, nonquantitative, phenomenological, or anti-positivist approach.[4]

This evolution naturally led to some tensions between the area centers and the disciplines, on the one hand, and the new social science area studies and the old cultural/historical ones. Ward notes: "Both graduate students and faculty with area specializations are still viewed with suspicion in many behavioral quarters. They are not infrequently regarded as a different breed, inherently inferior in quality, and of dubious loyalty to the cause--not true believers."[5]

Scholars from the traditional fields of regional study--language, culture, and history--frequently criticized the new social scientists as inexpert in the area. Simultaneously, some disciplinarians called the same young people inexpert in the disciplines. It was and is a painful bind--but one easier to endure when funds were as plentiful as they were in the 1960's.

What were the objectives of the area centers? Nowadays they are often not specified. In earlier times, though, one could find fairly explicit statements of what the new centers hoped to accomplish. The same goals recurred for most regions:

(1) To produce experts knowledgeable about the various areas of the world.

(2) To influence U.S. foreign policy and thereby to benefit both the United States and the countries in question.

(3) To internationalize universities by bringing area expertise into contact with main-line courses, disciplines, technical assistance programs, and so forth.

(4) To internationalize public education by producing knowledge and materials that would filter down to public schools and public opinion.

(5) Most importantly, to make intellectual contributions of a new sort that built on interdisciplinary, regionally oriented research.

Looking at the Achievements of Area Centers

It is, of course, difficult for an outsider to appraise intellectual progress or even practical import. However, considerable soul-searching has taken place at conferences, in learned journals and professional bulletins, and in donor agencies, concerning the achievements of area studies over the past thirty years. In trying to pull together some of the views of insiders here, there is no desire to paint a one-sided picture nor to claim that the answers are in. But attempting an overview may be helpful in stimulating and focussing discussion.

(1) Many area specialists were produced. Richard D. Lambert's review showed how vast the number of regional experts had become by 1969.[6] It is difficult to define an "expert" or a "specialist"--indeed, Lambert noted that only 17 percent of those he called area specialists on Asia had full competence in a language of the region. But by one count, from 1969 to 1979 the stock of "international studies specialists" doubled, to a total of 17,500.[7] McCaughey estimates that the number of international studies Ph.D.'s doubled every nine years from 1940 to 1973.[8]

The growth in numbers was astonishing in almost every region of study. The rate of production of Latin American specialists increased sixfold during the decades of the 1960's.[9] Scholars on Japan, China, Eastern Europe, Africa--all grew in numbers at unprecedented rates, sometimes exceeding the total numbers of experts elsewhere in the world, sometimes even in the very region being studied.[10] As P. J. Vatikiotis points out in a recent review of Middle Eastern studies in the United States:

> Ever since de Tocqueville published his austere observations about America, it has been a truism to state that everything that is done on that continent seems to be, in contrast to other Western communities, on a massive scale. Of the over 1,500 members of MESA, some 640 are Fellows, that is, recognized scholars of and "experts" on the Middle East. Over 400 are students. This a [sic] great number indeed, perhaps greater than the total number of scholars of the Middle East in the rest of the world.[11]

A recent Ford Foundation report[12] indicates that international studies (including area research) are considerably stronger in the United States than in Europe. In the United Kingdom, for example,

Larry Johnston of Oxford estimates that in 1975 there were "fewer than one hundred fifty people...working on the subject, and many of these are students working for the Ph.D. degree." Using the U.S. estimate of 17,500, on a per capita basis the United States has almost thirty times as many academic specialists in international studies as the United Kingdom. Descriptions of international studies in France, Germany, Italy, and Sweden use terms like "backwardness," "underdeveloped, to say the least," and "still a marginal subject [with] just a handful of scholars."

Quantity having been achieved, an issue for the 1980's may be better quality. "It appears that the standing of most specialists in the eyes of their disciplinary colleagues is not very high," observes Leonard Binder. "If the first phase of the development of Middle East studies was the expansion of the number of specialists, I think that task has been more than adequately achieved. The second phase...requires the adoption of far more stringent standards..."[13] (More on this point below.) Still, it is an achievement to have produced a relatively much larger number of Americans that understand different areas of the world.[14] Indeed, the current difficulties in attracting capable students to area specialties and in placing them afterwards, suggest to some observers the existence of an oversupply relative to the demands of business, government, and academy.[15]

(2) The hoped-for beneficial effects on U.S. foreign policy are controversial. It may be that academically certified area specialists have not been sufficiently (or efficiently) utilized in U.S. foreign

policy. Whatever the causes, it is probably fair to say that the emergence of large numbers of area specialists has not led to large improvements in U.S. foreign policy. On the other hand, there is a much larger quantity of relevant information and description available now on the various regions of the world than fifteen years ago. But former Secretary of State Kissinger and a recent C.I.A. review have worried that the research of area centers is mostly irrelevant to "mid-term" policy needs.[16] Academic critics such as Noam Chomsky and Marshall Windmiller bitterly accused the "academic specialists whom one would expect to be best informed" on Vietnam of having either remained silent or having supported the Administration.

The truth, indeed the meaning, of these labels and accusations is hard to assess; something here has the gait of a false issue. But for the proponent of area studies as a straightforward aid to U.S. foreign policy, there is little comfort either in the accusations or in defenses of area studies like James M. Rosenau's:

> A profound misconception, giving rise to false expectations, underlies the shrillness in the environment... The critics of the field have various complaints and are often contradictory, but they share the view that science can and ought to yield propositions and data relevant to ongoing policy situations...Since the researcher neither can nor seeks to meet this criterion of relevance, the critics are constantly able to find support for their conviction that present-day research is useless and trivial...The fact that the storehouse is presently empty is not a matter of concern if one is prepared to make a long-run wager.[17]

(3) The area centers have probably not "penetrated" American universities to the extent anticipated. "It was always a guiding principle of the ITR program," says a 1969 Ford Foundation document, "that international studies could only be soundly built in American Universities when they penetrated the established academic disciplines and professional specialties...Only as international studies spread widely in the fabric of university instruction can they escape the appearance or reality of being academic luxuries." It was debatable whether this had occurred by the late 1960's, with regard to the area centers. Allan Michie offered a rather extreme appraisal in 1968:

> In general, area centers have not become fixed in the U.S. university structure: they are often regarded as isolated, peripheral and to some degree temporary. They have had very little impact on undergraduate education within their institutions; more important, perhaps, the output of their scholarship--in men and materials--has had relatively little effect (for the money invested in such specialized studies) upon U.S. society and its understanding of other societies.[18]

It is difficult to measure "penetration," but by several plausible measures, the general situation in the late 1970's had not improved a great deal over Michie's description.

One might ask, for example, how many students take internationally oriented courses. Nationwide, according to the American Council on Education, only three percent of all undergraduate college students are enrolled in any courses that deal primarily with international affairs or foreign peoples or cultures.[19] Several officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated in interviews that area centers had done too little in changing undergraduate curricula.

One might also wonder to what extent professors and deans find the centers useful, indeed necessary, parts of the university. What would be lost if many area centers ceased to exist? In their recent review, Barber and Ilchman posed this and related questions to faculty at fifteen leading universities.

> There is little optimism on the campuses we visited that without external funding all the area centers would survive. Indeed, only about half of the administrators and faculty we interviewed thought that without external funds, which now means, for the most part, NDEA funds, even the strongest centers would continue. To be sure, there are a good many International Studies faculty members who think the university would be better off without the centers.[20]

When asked what features of area centers were valuable to them, professors answered as follows. Less than half valued the centers for their "integrative functioning" (42 percent of tenured faculty, 50 percent of non-tenured faculty). Almost half cited secretarial services. Only a third thought centers were "important for curriculum development and for faculty recruitment."[21]

Finally, one might wonder how well the area centers had blended in with technical assistance efforts, language departments, and the professional schools. It is not a particularly novel idea that there should be mutual enhancement: in 1954, according to a Ford Foundation document, there were already "signs of a shift" in the area centers toward "functional areas" and the involvement of law schools. But the mixing has not proved particularly easy.

For example, in 1974 Francis X. Sutton remarked:

> There has been temptation to believe that the new sophistication of development assistance promises happy marriages between development and area specialists. I am by no means sure that this will happen. I rather suspect that our economists, hydrologists, agronomists, and all the multifarious array of disciplinary specialists will never be meshed neatly with scholars on the areas where they happen to be working.[22]

Rose Hayden of the American Council of Education noted in an interview that "language and area people do not get together on most campuses" and that most area centers had enjoyed "a great deal less than success" in their relationships with professional schools. Until recently, professors at area centers had little desire for contact with professional education. An example is the plaintive note of a survey published in 1977 about the willingness of area centers to work with business schools:

> The World Studies Data Bank supplied names and addresses of 696 area studies programs. Questionnaires were sent to all of these, but only 55 usable questionnaires were returned. The percentage is too low to draw any valid conclusions, except that it does suggest that most of the area studies chairpersons do not find the subject of much interest to them.[23]

Apparently this mood is now changing, as many universities consider joint courses and joint programs between the professional schools and the area centers. But over most of the past twenty-five years, area centers have remained remarkably isolated at universities. There has been little interaction among the area centers or between any of the centers and overseas technical assistance, language departments, and the professional schools.

(4) According to many people, the intellectual products of the area centers have not trickled down to the schools and the general public. This subject is obviously a difficult one to assess, not least

because in their efforts to obtain financial support some contemporary advocates of area studies may convey an overly bleak impression of the degree of internationalization that has occurred. After listening to some of these proponents, one might be tempted to conclude that all the previous efforts hardly dented America's parochialism and that, therefore, additional funds of the amounts likely to be provided would hardly help. (Advocacy often has that two-edged quality.)

One does not need to rely entirely on inferences from current low levels to past low productivity. At least one careful study has been done. In 1976, the Asia Society published Asia in American Textbooks: An Evaluation, in which 99 reviewers (44 scholars and 55 teachers) evaluated 306 textbooks used in social studies in grades K to 12. The conclusion was firmly worded:

> The collators of this report have concluded that the texts do not come close to reflecting what thoughtful educators have been recommending for years for teaching about other cultures...If the basic texts are characteristic of social studies curricula across the country, then serious questions should be raised about the effectiveness of the entire post-World War II movement in "international" education or "global" studies.[24]

(5) Many insiders doubt that area studies have produced new sorts of intellectual contributions that build on interdisciplinary, regional research. In effect, the basic assumption of area studies can be called into question: that by looking across countries at a region with the tools of many disciplines, new kinds of insights are obtained.

This dimension of the achievements of area centers is the most difficult to gauge--especially for an outsider. A fair review is complicated by several factors. Smouldering debates between

comparativists and regionalists, on the one hand, and humanists/historians and social scientists, on the other, render suspect the summary judgments of some interested parties. Reviews of intellectual progress are occasionally attempted by a group of scholars; but they, too, may lose credibility because of their explicit orientation towards the raising of new funds. All fields are subject to another sort of stock-taking, which belittles past achievements in an effort to redouble future efforts. (Presidential addresses to the American Economic Association are a convenient non-international example.) Finally, the "basic assumption" cited above may have never been seriously adopted at the area centers. One may therefore complain that only the usual standards of research productivity be applied: the disciplinary contributions of individual scholars, who happen to spend some of their time in area centers.[25]

There can be no doubt that absolutely and relative to many other fields, area studies have grown over the past thirty years. And yet in each of the areas, there are signs of reexamination, even disarray. Many of the great generalists, who provided leadership and coherence, have reached retirement age. Their successors, of necessity in an expanding field trained as specialists, have often seemed less eager to stake out broad directions and priorities for research. Most importantly, some of the "regions" as such have not proved coherent units of analysis, and few of the best research products of the area centers have been interdisciplinary.

These statements are harsh to some ears. But listen to lengthier renditions, taken from "insider" opinion on many different varieties of area studies.[26] By no means should these remarks be considered summary judgments on huge fields of study; the point is rather that common themes exist.

Area studies in general. "My argument, then, is not that area programs were useless. But I do contend that they have by now largely outlived their usefulness. Originally conceived chiefly to correct imbalances in factual knowledge, they have by now contributed to an imbalance of another kind: between factual knowledge of alien countries, chiefly of the 'humanistic' kind, and our ability to make theoretical sense of that knowledge--to solve general theoretical problems of macropolitics...There would seem now to be a primary need to counteract the manifest parochialism of the area programs themselves (and they are parochial, in their own ways) and to create, in political and other social sciences, communities of the sort that have always been common in the physical sciences: 'problem-communities,' united by common interests in coming to grips with general theoretical issues not unique to peoples and places."[27]

- "The question is really: Why is there dissatisfaction? Perhaps, as we look at the last eighteen or so years of comparative, international, and area research--having rushed out with enthusiasm and high hopes in the scientific method--we now ask ourselves 'What has it all added up to?' and have to answer 'Not very much.'"[28]

- "To begin with the area camp is in considerable disarray...What actually exist are very loose congeries of academics united only by a

common interest in particular areas such as Japan, China, India, Slavic Europe, or Latin America and lacking any common identity or organization that transcends such specific regions or cultural areas. They certainly do not share anything so pretentious as a methodology or theory."[29]

Soviet studies. "At present, the field of Soviet studies seems to be in a state of uncertainty...The initial excitement has passed, research funds are less available, and there are profound doubts about the quality of past work. Whereas in the 1950s there was widespread agreement among scholars as to what were the appropriate basic assumptions about the Soviet political system, by the 1970s there was uncertainty and doubt."[30]

Western European studies. "...Those of us whose interests focus on Western Europe...thought almost exclusively in terms of individual research. The basic organizing principle of non-western language and area studies has been the training of area specialists, but the notion of area specialization has not been widely accepted among scholars who work on Western Europe and training activities carried on by European studies programs have normally been limited to preparation for dissertation research."[31]

Southeast Asian studies. [Professor Joseph Fischer of Berkeley sent a letter to "all identifiable Southeast Asianists" saying, "I want to know what 'grabs you or gripes you' most about the past or present development of Southeast Asian studies."] "The responses and Professor Fischer's reflections on them indicate a wide range of concerns,

from which one can detect a sense of (not extreme) dismay that the field has not lived up to its potential...The result is the acceptance by Southeast Asianists of the imagery of fragmentation, leading to the assumption of the near--perhaps total--impossibility of developing a fully integrated 'field.'"[32]

Japanese studies. "Our review of the history and present state of Japanese studies has now added a third element to this crisis, namely the search for academic legitimacy and status on the part of Japanese studies. This is in large part a problem internal to the field itself... No such denial of legitimacy afflicts Japanese specialists in disciplines such as language, literature, religion, fine arts, or history...The problem does exist, however, for economists, sociologists, political scientists, psychologists, and--again for different reasons--philosophers interested in non-Western thought systems...We tended to focus more on our area than on our disciplinary identifications, to be more cult-like in our absorption with the mystique of a non-Western language and culture, and to cluster more in area-oriented groups that constituted a form of defensive alliance against the perceived suspicion and rivalry on the part of the traditional departments...The future of Japanese studies thus leads beyond the area approach in the conventional sense...For the practitioners of Japanese studies the need is for more theoretically- and comparatively-oriented studies as a means of assimilating their knowledge into the mainstream of academic concern.[33]

Latin American studies. "The quantity of research produced by U.S. Latin Americanists, while impressive, is described from the Latin American

perspective as often uncoordinated, non-cumulative, and based on theoretical approaches that do not reflect Latin American reality... Financial exigencies are forcing some U.S. universities away from the area approach and back toward the disciplines, while the exigencies of development needs have led Latin American institutions away from traditional patterns toward a change agent role. It is notable in this respect that the Latin American regional studies center is typically an autonomous institute with a problem-solving orientation...The role of Latin American studies is in flux, and this is particularly the case in the United States. Latin Americans are more united in their perception of the role of area study than U.S. Latin Americanists, because their mission orientation provides them with a focal point for training and research."[34]

Middle Eastern studies. "There is no doubt that the generosity of foundations and the federal government in the last 20 years enabled hundreds of American university teachers to study the Middle East. But it also encouraged the unnecessary proliferation of programs and dissipation of effort and resources...A distortion of what actually takes place within Middle Eastern studies is condoned in the name of wider, universal theoretical considerations and political or ideological predilections. Double standards of judgment in the study of the Middle East are justified by relevance and excused by relativism to the point of absurd reductionism."[35]

Chinese studies. "Chinese studies have fallen under two large headings: traditional China and contemporary (or modern, or recent)

China...Fifteen years ago there was a great sense of urgency about our lack of scholarly competence in the contemporary field. In our studies of traditional China we have been heirs to a rich native tradition. In the systematic study of contemporary China there has been significantly less to build upon...(M)ajor funding has been allotted according to priorities designed to develop expertise on contemporary China. In particular, social science competence has been sought...This review...led to the following points being widely accepted by the conferees: 1. The imbalance in funding and encouragement has not lessened the relative strength of traditional Chinese studies in relation to contemporary studies despite quite rapid growth in facilities for the latter, and the number of scholars specializing in contemporary China. Neither has it yet produced the hoped-for flowering of high quality contemporary and social science studies of China...2. The grave concern at present is not about competing demands for support to traditional and contemporary studies; it is about academic and intellectual standards in both..."[36]

Generalizing across these many fields and objectives is risky. One's estimate of "success" may depend on what one expected or should have expected, regarding each of the five objectives. Even though judgments are therefore subjective, a few summary propositions seem defensible.

First, the area centers produced many new experts and much useful material on other cultures and regions. A certain capacity exists now that did not before--in terms of people, information, library facilities, and professional networks.

Second, the very best studies produced in area centers do not deal with areas, are not interdisciplinary, and are not done by teams of

researchers. Rather, they are specialized and detailed intra-country studies done by individual scholars usually stressing a single discipline. For example, Alfred G. Meyer writes about Soviet studies:

> Looking over the total work on Soviet and East European politics that has been done in the past twenty-five years, and picking out what I consider the best research done so far--those books that provide the most enlightenment about the nature of politics in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe--my vote would go to a few careful and exhaustive descriptions of selective institutions, processes, or elites.[37]

A glance at the publications lists of many area centers supports this proposition. One discovers a multitude of specialized, intra-country studies, with little overlap among scholars and little apparent interdisciplinarity.

Third, some of the regions have turned out not to be particularly coherent units of analysis. Haas, Rummel, Brams, and others have seemed to prove that the various spheres of activity--political, economic, cultural, and the like--are relatively independent of one another.[38] Furthermore, inter-country differences within regions, as well as commonalities or interesting comparisons across regions, are attracting greater attention among area specialists.

Fourth, many scholars in area studies perceive the need to move beyond the interdisciplinary and regional hopes of the past, toward problem-oriented and theoretical/comparative research that would involve other regions of the world.

Fifth, as a consequence it may now be an opportune time for the area centers to think hard about their missions and modes of organization. It may even be worth considering new ways of compartmentalizing and funding foreign area research.

Implications for Universities

Severe problems plague most area centers--and not just budgetary difficulties. Within centers, one finds what seems to be greater intellectual chaos. (As one wag put it, echoing Yeats, "Things fall apart. The center will not hold.") Among centers--and between centers and other university entities--there is usually little cross-fertilization or even useful interaction. Commissions that simply cite a supposed need for more international studies often overlook the question that educational policymakers--presidents and deans as well as government officials--cannot help but scrutinize: Would more of the same alleviate those national and intellectual shortcomings? Taking an affirmative answer for granted may be convenient advocacy, but it does not square well with the record; nor, in the last analysis, is it likely to help us get on with the task.

Several issues might be examined in reviews of international studies in general and area centers in particular. Their relative importance, perhaps even their precise meaning, will vary from university to university. How these concerns are raised--by whom, in what forum, with what inducements and under what constraints--matters to the outcome, and on this score general advice is of little use. Nonetheless, it is opportune to stimulate new thinking among international centers along several lines:

(1) Undergraduate training. Many universities have implemented or are considering new, basic courses on other cultures--courses aimed particularly at undergraduates. At Harvard, for example, a dozen new "core courses" were initiated in 1979-80 under the rubric of foreign civilizations and cultures. They seem to have had an energizing effect not only

on particular professors but on some of the area centers. Thinking of area centers primarily, or even largely, as research clubs for professors, visitors, and a few graduate students may no longer be tenable--if it ever was.

But the teaching function raises thorny, if interesting, questions of academic planning and management. How do centers fit with departments? How are cross-cutting courses staffed, evaluated, compensated? Can the educational aims of such courses be carefully specified? Can centers work to develop higher level courses as well as introductory ones? Can international centers play a role in devising "packages" for undergraduates, consisting of core courses, language training, research, and an overseas sojourn?

(2) The research agenda. The area centers face some common problems in the reduced availability of funds for research and graduate fellowships. As noted earlier, several national bodies are now reviewing international studies and area programs. What is lacking is what individual universities and centers themselves have to provide: a careful delineation of a few important topics in each region on which substantial progress could be made with reasonable funding over the next five to eight years.

Apparently a good number of area specialists believe that the research agenda should, at least in part, turn to interregional studies of major theoretical and practical issues. Are there such issues of common interest to several centers? Is it opportune to stimulate new sorts of seminars and cross-cutting research efforts? Might funds be jointly raised for such activities?

Acting in concert at the university level, centers might be able to supply a research agenda that would demonstrate by example the intellectual vigor of international studies. Universities would then be in a strong position to lobby for area research. Such strategic planning--which should not be a philosophical justification for studying foreign areas and certainly would not preclude individual research on different topics--would not only help the national discussions but could also serve as a platform for fund-raising.

(3) Professional schools. New opportunities are arising for interesting collaboration with the professional schools. Instructional possibilities include courses designed for Masters students at various schools, joint programs, cooperation on continuing education and executive training, and involvement with postdoctoral scholars at the professional schools. A university-wide forum for examining these possibilities may be valuable. On the one hand, fruitful possibilities may now be missed because of a lack of information. On the other, as the centers and schools expand in these directions, it may be worthwhile to consider together which of the myriad possible good ideas is most needed, most distinctive, most efficient.

(4) Information. Many universities may quite easily be able to do much better at linking various international activities (and foreign students) to each other and to the other academic entities. For example, visiting scholars at international centers, postdoctoral visitors to the professional schools, the many foreign students and interested American students, and faculty members themselves are often not well informed

about the centers' staff and activities. In some cases, it may be desirable to limit public knowledge of particular events. But the "networking" of interested parties, while perhaps not a glamorous task, might be the most feasible single step toward greater internationalization of the University. How can existing media, such as newsletters and faculty advisers, be better utilized? Can computerized information banks be created and effectively utilized? And so forth.

(5) Management. The lack of tight organization at most international centers can be traced plausibly to several underlying conditions. First, the centers often have independent sources of funds, both endowments and outside grants and contracts; this makes them more autonomous than the departments. Second, centers are manned by professors. Having tenure, they can "do what they like," particularly when research, rather than teaching, is at issue. Third, centers rarely have a professional staff at the management level. For busy professor-directors, there may be neither the time nor the incentives to pull together plans.

New modes of organization might be considered. On the mundane side, certain overhead functions might be shared. Universities might also consider whether fundamental organizational changes would be worthwhile. For example:

- What sort of coordinating council across centers would be most effective?
- Would an Associate Dean or a Provost for international activities be desirable?

- Could one center, perhaps a center for international studies, play a catalyzing role across the regional centers?

- Would a functional or theoretical organizing principle, perhaps combined with the current regional orientations to create a single matrix organization, promote new and worthwhile sorts of research?

- Could foreign visitors be invited for longer stays, perhaps with term professorships of three years, and be involved in instruction as well as research?

- Should centers have overseas affiliations: sister centers, foreign members, or other possibilities?

Contrary to much of the current advocacy rhetoric, the main issues facing international studies at American universities probably do not involve more centers, more scholarships, more research funds. Instead, a harder look needs to be taken at the educational and scholarly aims and achievements of international research centers. Reviews of this sort that are useful are likely to be local: at particular centers and universities. And such reviews are likely to focus on new sorts of planning, management, and integration as the key steps for the future. More of the same will, in most cases, not be a feasible or desirable response.

Footnotes

[1]See, for example, President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1979. In national reviews so far--including such institutions as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, National Endowment for the Humanities, American Council for Education, and the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education--the views of interested parties have predominated, and they tend to be strongly positive about international activities. Sometimes these views seem hortatory and shallow, simply citing the importance of international studies and the decline in available funds. Too often, calls for action have a whiny tone and a simple, numerical objective. For example, many advocates of international studies call for a return to the (real) funding levels of 1966. They stop short of saying what would be obtained by doing so and how. As Samuel Huntington has written of the aim of a foreign aid budget equal to one percent of the gross national product: "It is difficult to conceive of a more telling admission of bankruptcy of purpose than the enthusiasm with which the proponents of economic development have espoused this target. Such a figure is, of course, completely unrelated to the differing and changing interests and purposes of the aid donors; it is almost equally unrelated to the differing and changing requirements of the aid-receivers." ("Foreign Aid for What and for Whom," Foreign Policy, No. 1, Winter 1970-71, p. 172.)

[2]Useful histories are provided in the as-yet-unpublished work of Robert McCaughey, International Studies and the University: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning; and in Robert E. Ward, "Culture and the Comparative Study of Politics," in Lucien W. Pye, ed., Political Science and Area Studies: Rivals or Partners, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1975.

[3]Cf. Barber and Ilchman's recent review of international studies at fifteen major universities: "...International Studies faculty seldom act as a lobby within the university. Indeed, the fact that they identify with regions or with their departments probably contributes to the difficulty they have acting as a group to ensure a more cosmopolitan direction for a university. More often than not they see each other as chief competitors for scarce funds, not common laborers in the same vineyard." (Elinor G. Barber and Warren Ilchman, with the assistance of Creighton Peet and Toby Kitz, International Studies Review, draft, New York, The Ford Foundation, May 1979, mimeo, p. 19.)

[4]Leonard Binder, The Study of the Middle East: Research and Scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1976, p. 16.

[5]Robert E. Ward, "Culture and the Comparative Study of Politics," in Lucien W. Pye, ed., op. cit., p. 43.

[6]Language and Area Studies, Philadelphia, American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973.

[7]Barber and Ilchman, op. cit., provide this table:

Estimated Distribution of Current Stock of Ph.D.-Trained Personnel in International Studies in the United States, 1979

Area			Discipline		
Latin America	19%	3,400	History	25%	4,300
East Asia	19	3,400	Political Science	20	3,500
Eastern Europe/Soviet Union	16	2,800	Language & Literature	20	3,500
			Anthropology	11	2,000
South Asia/Southeast Asia	16	2,800	Economics	11	2,000
			Other Humanities	8	1,400
Middle East/N. Africa	10	1,800	Sociology	5	800
International and Comparative	9	1,500			
	100%	17,500		100%	17,500

[8]Robert A. McCaughey, "The Permanent Revolution: An Assessment of the Current State of International Studies in American Universities," a report to the International Division of the Ford Foundation, Spring 1979, processed, p. 10.

[9]Latin American Studies: New Roles, New Constraints, New York, Institute of International Education, 1976, p. 2.

[10]For example: "In a seeming paradox, the Latin American graduate student who wished to pursue Latin American studies had to leave his region in order to learn about it, typically through a graduate program in the United States or Europe." (Ibid., p. 3.) The production of Sovietologists is an exception. After soaring in the 1960's, by 1973 the number of new Ph.D.'s dropped to the levels of the 1940's.

[11]"Middle Eastern Studies in America: A Memorandum," The Washington Review of Strategic and International Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1978, p. 93.

[12]International Studies in Six European Countries, New York, The Ford Foundation, 1976. I am indebted to Robert McCaughey for this citation.

[13]Binder, op. cit., p. 7.

[14]Several Harvard experts, however, note that in certain areas first-rate talent is extremely scarce. Professor Dwight Perkins notes that it is difficult to find a qualified expert on Korea; Professor Edwin Reischauer laments that, despite the war, America still lacks scholars of major stature on Vietnam; and Professor Abram Bergson notes that almost no first-rate economists on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are currently produced anywhere in the United States.

[15]See also Barber and Ilchman, op. cit., pp. 40-5; Task Force on Business and International Education, Business and International Education, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1977; and Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy, by Sue Berryman, Paul F. Langer, John Pincus, and Richard H. Solomon, with the assistance of Ellen H. Gelbard and Priscilla M. Schlegel, Santa Monica, The Rand Corporation, September 1979.

[16]See, for example, the "Final Report" of the Task Force on Mid-Term Research for Foreign Policy, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, no date (1976?). An August 1978 document from the Central Intelligence Agency indicts area studies as "irrelevant."

[17]"Adaptive Strategies for Research and Practice in Foreign Policy," in Fred W. Riggs, International Studies: Present Status and Future Prospects, Philadelphia, American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1971, p. 223.

[18]Higher Education and World Affairs, New York, Education and World Affairs, 1968, pp. 15-16.

[19]Robert E. Ward, National Needs for International Education, Washington, D.C., Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, 1977, p. 5. Gerald S. Maryanov concurs: "In any case, the argument being presented here is that area or cross-cultural understanding has not become part of the undergraduate curriculum, except for the relatively few undergraduates who seek it out and pursue it relentlessly." (The Condition of Southeast Asian Studies in the United States: 1972, Association for Asian Studies, 1974, p. 29.)

[20]Barber and Ilchman, op. cit., p. 47. They note: "The importance of the centers as such appears to vary quite a bit from university to university: at Michigan, UCLA, and Wisconsin, faculty would genuinely regret their disappearnace. In other universities, like Chicago or Yale, centers as such matter less to faculty than the kinds of funds for students and libraries that center support provides, and at Columbia there are some faculty who are reasonably comfortable with the 'institutes' only now that their strength is much reduced, though many remain nostalgic about the days of strong centers" (pp. 47-8).

[21]Ibid., p. 47.

[22]"The International Role of the University in the Decades Ahead: Prospects and Realities," in Sutton, F. Champion Ward, and James A. Perkins, Internationalizing Higher Education: A United States Approach, Occasional Paper No. 13, New York, International Council for Educational Development, 1974, pp. 10-11.

[23]Task Force on Business and International Education, Business and International Education, op. cit.

[24]New York, The Asia Society, Inc., 1976, pp. 252, 253. The Middle Eastern Studies Association published a similarly grim appraisal of the trickle down to textbooks.

[25]This is not the place to discuss the general hazards of interdisciplinary work, but it is worth opening a parenthesis briefly. "Interdisciplinarity" is a difficult concept, especially since in many of the social sciences what is often produced is description, rather than explanation or generalization. Direct, overt, conscious efforts to link various disciplines in research are rare everywhere, not just at area centers. More frequent may be the stimulation that comes from hearing a first-rate colleague from a different department unpack a problem that has some connection to one's own work: a sort of indirect interdisciplinarity. A number of professors favorably cited this function of the area centers. But this is also a function of departments and schools; and the question recurs, what are the particular intellectual benefits of an area approach, which specifically tries to involve members from many disciplines on a particular region?

[26]Some of these sentiments are not novel. For example, in 1964 George E. Taylor, Director of the University of Washington's Far Eastern and Russian Institute, acknowledged that cooperative, interdisciplinary research, generally considered a distinguishing feature of area studies, rarely occurred; and Richard Morse of Yale questioned whether Latin American studies had progressed since the early nineteenth century. ("The Non-Western World in Higher Education," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 346, November 1964.)

[27]Harry Eckstein, "A Critique of Area Studies from a West European Perspective," in Pye, op. cit., p. 215, emphasis added.

[28]Wendell Bell, Conference Discussion III, in Riggs, op. cit., p. 216.

[29]Robert E. Ward, in Pye, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

[30]Pye, op. cit., p. 99.

[31]Stephen Blank, Western European Studies in the United States, Council for European Studies, 1975, p. 136.

[32]Maryanov, op. cit., pp. 4, 36.

[33]SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Japanese Studies, Japanese Studies in the United States: A Report on the State of the Field, Current Resources and Future Needs, Social Science Research Council and American Council of Learned Societies, 1970, processed, pp. 22, 24, 26, 28.

[34]Latin American Studies..., op. cit., pp. 9, 8, 10.

[35]Vatikiotis, "Middle Eastern Studies in America...," op. cit., p. 95.

[36]American Council of Learned Societies and Social Science Research Council, Conference on Priorities for Funding and Development of Chinese Studies, Report, New York, no date (conference was November 1973), mimeo, pp. 5-6.

[37]"Comparative Politics and Its Discontent: The Study of the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe," in Pye, op. cit., p. 115.

[38]See, for example Earnest B. Haas, Beyond the Nation State: Functionalism and International Organization, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1966; S. Brams, "A Note on the Cosmopolitanism of World Regions, Journal of Peace Research, No. 1, 1968.